DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 188 502 FL 011 660

AUTHOR Fernandes, Kathleen
TITLE Survey of Needs for Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance.
INSTITUTION California Univ., Los Angeles. Center for the Study of Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY National Inst. of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO CSE-129
PUB DATE Jun 79
NOTE 26p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Educational Assessment; Educational Needs; Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; National Surveys; *Needs Assessment; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Technical Assistance

ABSTRACT

This report describes a needs survey administered at the first National Bilingual Education Management Institute. The purpose of the survey was to discover the major needs for evaluation training in bilingual programs. The survey dealt with the following areas of concern: identification of evaluation topics that would be useful and of interest to workshops; and the manner in which project evaluations are carried out and how the results are used. Some of the most frequently mentioned topics in the first part of the survey were program planning and development of an evaluation design, utilization of evaluation results, and evaluation of project management. In the second part of the survey the following topics were considered: (1) evaluation features that were required under the terms of project contracts and how effectively the projects had satisified each requirement; (2) evaluation tasks that caused difficulties for projects and the reasons for the difficulties; (3) the usefulness of the most recent project evaluation for making changes in the project; (4) recommendations for improving the evaluation of bilingual projects; and (5) evaluation topics where there is a need for technical assistance or training. (AMH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED188502

SURVEY OF NEEDS FOR BILINGUAL EVALUATION TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

Kathleen Fernandes

CSE Report No. 129

June 1979

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. Young, UCLA

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance Project
Center for the Study of Evaluation
Graduate School of Education, UCLA
Los Angeles, California 90024

FL 011 660

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant from the National Institute of Education, Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the National Institute of Education, and no official endorsement by the National Institute of Education should be inferred.

The Bilingual Evaluation Program at the Center for the Study of Evaluation has been commissioned by the National Institute of Education to develop a series of modular workshops to train practitioners and community members in the evaluation of bilingual programs. The workshops being designed by the Bilingual Evaluation Technical Assistance (BETA) Project will serve dual purposes. First, they are intended to improve the quality and usefulness of project evaluations by disseminating techniques and information which users can adopt or adapt to meet local needs. Second, the workshops are intended to improve the skills needed by the participants in performing their roles within the project's evaluation.

Three sources of information have been used to identify the evaluation needs of the intended audience: (1) a review of federal and state legislative requirements for the design and evaluation of bilingual projects;[1] (2) a review of the literature on the "state of the art" in bilingual program evaluation;[1] and (3) a survey of bilingual project administrators dealing with evaluation practice and training needs. This report presents the results of the survey in the following terms: a description of the instrument, the respondents, and their programs; the importance and interest of various evaluation topics to the respondents; evaluation requirements and effectiveness in meeting them; difficult evaluation tasks; use of evaluation results by various audiences; and recommendations for evaluation and for technical assistance.

---

[1] The legislative and literature reviews are reported elsewhere:
Irizarry, R. A. Bilingual education: State and federal legislative mandates. Implications for program design and evaluation. Available through the National Dissemination and Assessment Center for Bilingual Education, Title VII, California State University, Los Angeles, Los Angeles, Ca. 90032.

Cabello, B., Elvenstar, D., Garcia, P., & Sisson, B. Variables relevant to the evaluation of bilingual education programs: A review of the literature. Center for the Study of Evaluation (working document).

The survey instrument contained three types of items: a set of evaluation features or topics which the respondents rated on a variety of dimensions; several questions where the respondents could select as many of the response options as were applicable; and a few open-ended questions which allowed the respondents to raise issues which may not have been addressed elsewhere in the form. The survey was administered at the First Annual National Bilingual Education Management Institute in October 1977.[2] The Institute was sponsored by the Office of Bilingual Education in the U.S. Office of Education and included representatives from the Title VII network across the country. The survey instrument was distributed to participants at the Institute. Ninety-nine forms were completed; these comprised the sample on which the needs survey was based. The purpose of the needs assessment was to discover the major needs for evaluation training in bilingual programs, not to make precise parameter estimates of them. Thus, the sample was judged to be appropriate because of the respondents' key positions, their availability, and the geographic dispersion of their programs.

Frequency counts and percentages were calculated for the full sample and for a subsample consisting of respondents associated with local educational agencies (LEAs). The remainder of this report describes the survey results and conclusions. Because there were very few differences in the pattern of responses between the full sample and the LEA sample, the statements made apply to both groups except where otherwise noted. The tables at the end of the report present the number of respondents for each question and the percentage of them that chose each question option. Where multiple responses were possible, numbers and percentages are given for both respondents and responses.

---

[2]We wish to express our appreciation to Ruddie Irizarry for designing and administering the survey and to the Office of Bilingual Education for providing time on the Institute program to collect the data.

The respondents in the sample consisted predominantly of representatives from LEAs around the country (82%) and were most likely to be directors or administrators of bilingual projects (89%). Although the respondents came from 26 states, nearly one-third (32%) of the sample was from California. Most (74%) worked in projects supported solely by ESEA Title VII funds, the remainder in programs with several funding sources including Title VII. There was a considerable range in years of experience in bilingual education, with one respondent indicating that (s)he has been involved in the field for more than 20 years. Most of the sample had had considerably less experience; the median was about five years in bilingual education. The respondents had been in their present positions for considerably less time, with nearly half of the full sample (47%) in their jobs for one year or less. The LEA sample had somewhat more job tenure but only slightly so.

Of the respondents in the LEA sample, about half (53%) were associated with bilingual projects that were in their second or third year of operation. The programs were more likely to be maintenance (56%) than transitional (33%) but a few (8%) combined both approaches. About half (52%) of the LEA samples were associated with projects that covered some or all of the elementary grades. One-sixth (17%) spanned kindergarten through eighth grade, and another one-fourth (27%) covered the high school grades (9-12). Although a few of the respondents (12%) indicated that their projects served more than 1,000 students, most projects were considerably smaller, the mode (52%) having 51 to 499 students. Seventeen language groups were served by respondents in the LEA sample. Spanish was the most

frequently cited, being checked by 89% of the respondents and making up 57% of the languages reported.

In order to identify areas of need and interest for evaluation workshops, respondents were asked to rate a list of evaluation topics according to (1) the <u>importance</u> of the topics to the respondents' position and (2) their <u>interest</u> in attending a workshop on the topic. Of the twenty-six topics being rated all but three were considered as "essential" for performing one's job by at least 40% of the respondents. The topics receiving the highest percentage of "essential" ratings were:

- o program planning--needs assessment, goal setting, stating objectives (75%)
- o utilization of evaluation results (72%)
- o development of an evaluation design (69%)
- o overview of evaluation--how it relates to the educational program (68%)
- o evaluation of project management (67%)

The topics considered least "essential" were:

- o the role of the internal or external evaluator in the project (39%)
- o reporting of evaluation results to various audiences (38%)
- o selection of project evaluators -- qualifications (35%)

Respondents indicated a high level of interest in workshops on nearly all of the topics listed. In general, interest in a workshop on a given topic was directly related to the extent to which the topic was considered "essential" to one's job. Only three of the topics were of interest to less than 60% of the respondents, and two of these were also considered least "essential". Respondents reported the highest level of interest

in the following topics:

- o development of an evaluation design (86%)
- o utilization of evaluation results (85%)
- o evaluation of project management (83%)
- o assessment of the affective domain (82%)
- o selection of evaluation materials--instruments (81%)

Three of these five topics had received the most frequent "essential" ratings above. Although the other two topics were not among the most frequent, they were considered important to one's position by at least 60% of the respondents.

The remainder of the needs survey focused on the manner in which project evaluations are carried out and how the results are used. Respondents were shown a list of 25 evaluation features and asked to mark those that were required under the terms of their project contract and to rate how effectively their project had satisfied each requirement. The following features were checked by at least 70 of the respondents as being required:

- o measurement of oral language proficiency and/or dominance in English (n=83)
- o measurement of achievement in reading or language arts in English (n=81)
- o descriptive information about the content and substance of the project (n=81)
- o measurement of oral language proficiency and/or dominance in a language other than English (n=79)
- o assessment of staff in-service and training components (n=79)
- o descriptive information on program implementation (n=75)

- measurement of achievement in reading or language arts in a language other than English (n=73)
- measurement of community involvement in the project (n=73)
- descriptive statistics about the extent of program participation (n=71)

At least half of the respondents rated their methods of satisfying these requirements as either moderately or extremely effective for eight of the nine areas. The exception was measuring reading achievement in the primary language, where only one-third of the sample felt their methods had the same level of effectiveness. Nearly all of the respondents were doing something to satisfy these nine requirements; only 5 to 10 percent indicated that they were still exploring methods.

The four areas checked least often (by less than half of the respondents) as required parts of the project evaluation were:

- cost effectiveness measures of project components (n=39)
- field testing and assessment of instructional materials (n=40)
- measurement of achievement gains in subjects other than reading, language arts, or math (n=43)
- statistical validation of test instruments used in the project (n=44)

Less than half of the respondents rated their methods as either moderately or extremely effective for all four areas. In addition, about one-fifth of the respondents indicated that they had not found a method for satisfying these requirements.

Respondents were asked to check any of seven general evaluation tasks which caused difficulties for their projects and to describe the reasons for the difficulties. The task most frequently cited was planning the evaluation. Over 60% of the sample and 20% of the responses mentioned this task. The most frequently cited problem in planning was

locating valid test instruments, for example:

> "The selection of language proficiency/dominance tests is difficult. There are no instruments that will determine, to our satisfaction, the appropriate language of instruction for the students."

Other problems related to planning were setting goals, finding trained people (including an evaluator to carry out this task), and developing an evaluation design.

The six remaining tasks each comprised between 10% and 15% of the responses and were cited by 25% to 44% of the sample. Comments about the task of conducting the evaluation focused on the lack of time, both for data collection during the course of the school year and for testing by teachers in the classroom. Several respondents felt that their lack of background in statistics and the small size of their projects were limitations in the task of analyzing results. Some of the difficulties with the tasks of interpreting and reporting results were tied to problems with evaluation designs and instrumentation; results could sometimes be misleading and hard to generalize in ways that could be understood by other people. Comments about the task of justifying the results described problems with the accuracy and adequacy of the data and with the attitudes of the audience toward bilingual education, for example:

> "Test scores do not tell the whole story but evaluations contain only hard data. Programs are judged solely on these facts."

> "Results are not accepted. They are deemed to be biased even though positive growth is shown. It could be that a stereotype is being shattered."

According to the respondents, the task of utilizing evaluation results

was sometimes difficult because the results were not available or may have been in a form that decision makers could not use.

The final set of questions in the needs survey asked respondents about the usefulness of the most recent project evaluation for making changes in the project. The questions were answered only by those people who reported having knowledge of the most recent evaluation. This group consisted of about three-fourths of both the full sample and the LEA sample. More than half (55%) of the project evaluations were conducted by external evaluators. The results of the evaluation were reported to a variety of audiences; district and project administration were the most frequent recipients (about 90%), followed by the external funding source, school principals, and teaching staff (about 75%), and finally parents, community, and the school board (about 58%). Although the evaluation results were disseminated widely, not all of the audiences found them useful for decision making, in the respondents' opinion. The most striking discrepancy was for the district administration where only about half of the group was judged as finding the evaluation useful. However, the respondents were nearly unanimous in saying that they (i.e., the project administration) made use of the evaluation results.

Despite the limited usefulness of the evaluation, about three-fourths of the "knowledgeable" subsample indicated that the evaluation had been used in making project decisions. These decisions covered a variety of areas including:

- improvements in curriculum, such as new materials and equipment, changing in reading and math instruction, and an increased multicultural emphasis.
- increases in teaching staff, including the addition of more bilingual teachers, improved communication among staff, and reassessment of staff training needs.

- o changes in the evaluation design, selection of better tests, and improved data collection procedures.
- o improvements in procedures for assigning students and addition of classes to serve more students.
- o an increased commitment to bilingual education among district administrators, including changes in priorities and increases in budget.

Only one respondent mentioned a decision that had a negative effect on the program and students.

When asked what aspects of the evaluation contributed to its usefulness, respondents most frequently cited the type of analysis done and the manner of reporting results. Other aspects considered important were the qualifications and role of the evaluator, the comprehensiveness of the evaluation, and the participation of the staff. Less than 20% of the "knowledgeable" subsample indicated that the evaluation was not useful for decision making. These respondents cited the quality of the data analysis, failure of decision makers to use the results, the content of the evaluation, and the manner of presenting results as reasons for the evaluation's inutility.

All of the respondents were asked for their recommendations for improving the evaluations of bilingual projects. The most frequent recommendation (81% of the sample) was for increased availability of valid and reliable test instruments. About two-thirds (66%) of the sample felt that technical assistance, primarily in the form of workshops, would improve project evaluations. The respondents indicated that they (i.e., project administrators) had the greatest need for a workshop but that such assistance should also be provided for the teaching staff

and for evaluators. Other forms of technical assistance mentioned by at least half of the respondents were consultants to participate in the development of an evaluation system and guidance materials and manuals for evaluation. A third area of recommendation covered topics outside the direct control of the project and included more specific evaluation requirements and more streamlined reporting systems.

In conclusion, the survey identified a number of evaluation topics where there is a need for technical assistance or training. These topics are:

- o evaluation management
- o development of evaluation designs
- o test selection and development
- o utilization of results

The results of the survey have been combined with the reviews of the research literature and legislative requirements and with the recommendations of the project's National Advisory Council to guide the workshop planning and development. The workshop series will be completed and ready for dissemination late in 1979.

Table 1
Frequencies and Percentages of
Responses to the Needs Survey*

State	Full Sample n	Full Sample %	LEA Sample n	LEA Sample %
	97		78	
Alaska		1.0		0.0
Arizona		3.1		2.6
California		32.0		35.9
Colorado		1.0		1.3
Connecticut		2.1		1.3
Florida		2.1		1.3
Kansas		1.0		1.3
Louisiana		2.1		2.6
Massachusetts		1.0		1.3
Michigan		3.1		3.8
Missouri		1.0		1.3
New Jersey		2.1		2.6
New Mexico		4.1		3.8
New York		10.3		9.0
North Carolina		1.0		1.3
Ohio		5.2		5.1
Oklahoma		1.0		1.3
Oregon		2.1		1.3
Pennsylvania		3.1		3.8
Rhode Island		2.1		1.3
South Dakota		1.0		0.0
Texas		12.4		12.8
Utah		2.1		1.3
Virginia		1.0		1.3
Washington		1.0		1.3
Wyoming		2.1		1.3
Organization	98		80	
U. S. Office of Education		4.1		
State Department of Education		2.0		
Dissemination/Training Center		0.0		
Local Education Agency		81.6		100.0
Institution of Higher Education		11.2		
Other: Education Service Center		1.0		
Funding Source for Program	98		79	
ESEA Title VII		73.5		69.6
ESEA Title VII, ESAA & state bilingual program		1.0		1.3
ESEA Title VII plus ESEA Title I, state or local funds		25.5		29.1

*Results are presented for the multiple-choice and responses to the open-ended questions have been omitted.

	Full Sample n	Full Sample %	LEA Sample n	LEA Sample %
Present Position	98		79	
Director or Administrator		88.8		88.6
Middle Management		4.1		2.5
Evaluator		1.0		1.3
Resource Personnel		3.1		3.8
Other (Bilingual specialist, program coordinator)		3.1		3.8
Years at Present Position	97		78	
1 year		47.4		39.7
2-3 years		28.9		34.6
4-5 years		12.4		12.8
6 years or more		11.3		12.8
Years in Bilingual Education	96		78	
1 year		12.5		11.5
2-3 years		20.8		23.1
4-5 years		20.8		19.2
6 years or more		45.8		46.2
Years Project in Operation			78	
1st year				17.9
2nd or 3rd year				52.6
4th or 5th year				14.1
6th year or more				15.4
Type of Bilingual Project			78	
Transitional				33.3
Maintenance				56.4
Combination of two				7.7
Teacher training				1.3
Other type of project (developmental, bilingual/bicultural)				1.3
Grades Covered by Project			79	
Lower elementary (K-3)				26.6
Upper elementary (4-6)				3.8
K-6				21.5
Junior high (7-8)				2.5
K-3, 7-8				1.3
4-6, 7-8				1.3
K-8				16.5
High school (9-12)				7.6
K-6, 9-12				1.3
7-12				6.3
K-12				11.4

	Full Sample n	Full Sample %	LEA Sample n	LEA Sample %
Number of Students in Project			67	
Less than 50				22.4
51 to 499				52.2
500 to 999				13.4
1000 or more				11.9

			Cases in LEA Sample n	Cases in LEA Sample %
Language Groups Served			79*	123
Chinese			6.3	4.1
French			6.3	4.1
Greek			3.8	2.4
Italian			2.5	1.6
Japanese			3.8	2.4
Korean			5.1	3.3
Native American Language			7.6	4.9
Philippine Language			5.1	3.3
Portuguese			5.1	3.3
Spanish			88.6	56.9
Vietnamese			13.9	8.9
Other (Arabic, Dutch, German, Hungarian, Russian, Thai)			7.6	4.9

* Multiple responses possible; results do not sum to 100.

Table 2

Evaluation Topic	Importance to Your Position: Full Sample n	Essential	Useful	Not Necessary	LEA Sample n	Essential	Useful	Not Necessary	Interest in Workshop: Full Sample n	Yes	No	LEA Sample n	Yes	No
1. Overview of evaluation--how it relates to the educational program	99	67.7	27.3	5.1	80	67.5	26.2	6.3	94	75.5	24.5	78	71.8	28.2
2. Development of an evaluation design	99	68.7	24.2	7.1	80	68.8	23.8	7.5	93	86.0	14.0	77	83.1	16.9
3. Program planning--needs assessment, goal setting, stating objectives	99	74.7	22.2	3.0	80	77.5	18.8	3.7	95	75.8	24.2	80	76.2	23.8
4. Selection of evaluation materials (instruments)	99	59.6	34.3	6.1	80	57.5	35.0	7.5	94	80.9	19.1	78	79.5	20.5
5. Development of evaluation materials (instruments)	99	55.6	28.3	16.2	80	51.2	30.0	18.8	95	67.4	32.6	79	64.6	35.4
6. Formative evaluation techniques	99	52.5	39.4	8.1	80	50.0	40.0	10.0	95	71.6	28.4	79	68.4	31.6
7. Summative evaluation techniques	98	52.0	39.8	8.2	80	48.8	41.2	10.0	93	71.0	29.0	79	68.4	31.6
8. Utilization of evaluation results	99	71.7	23.2	5.1	80	73.8	20.0	6.3	94	85.1	14.9	78	85.9	14.1
9. Procedures for data collection	99	54.5	38.4	7.1	80	52.5	38.7	8.7	93	67.7	32.3	77	66.2	33.8
10. The role of internal or external evaluator in the project	99	39.4	48.5	12.1	80	38.7	46.2	15.0	94	52.1	47.9	76	50.0	50.0
11. Selection of project evaluator qualifications	99	35.4	46.5	18.2	80	38.7	41.2	20.0	92	47.8	52.2	76	47.4	52.6
12. Reporting of evaluation results to various audiences	98	37.8	54.1	8.2	80	40.0	51.2	8.7	91	64.8	35.2	75	65.3	34.7
13. Analysis and interpretation of evaluation results	99	56.6	36.4	7.1	80	57.5	35.0	7.5	92	79.3	20.7	76	80.3	19.7
14. Assessment of oral language development in English	99	59.6	29.3	11.1	80	61.3	28.7	10.0	91	68.1	31.9	75	68.0	32.0
15. Assessment of oral language development in language other than English	99	58.6	31.3	10.1	80	58.7	32.5	8.7	92	72.8	27.2	75	72.0	28.0
16. Assessment of reading in English and determining reading proficiency	99	51.5	34.3	14.1	80	51.2	35.0	13.7	92	57.6	42.4	76	56.6	43.4
17. Assessment of reading in the language other than English and determining reading proficiency	99	61.6	28.3	10.1	80	61.3	31.3	7.5	96	75.0	25.0	78	75.6	24.4
18. Assessment of the affective domain (self concept, attitude toward school, attitude toward language and culture)	99	66.7	27.3	6.1	80	63.7	30.0	6.3	93	81.7	18.3	76	81.6	18.4

Evaluation Topic	Importance to Your Position: Full Sample n	Essential	Useful	Not Necessary	LEA Sample n	Essential	Useful	Not Necessary	Interest in Workshop: Full Sample n	Yes	No	LEA Sample n	Yes	No
19. Assessment of cognitive development	99	62.6	29.3	8.1	80	58.7	32.5	8.7	94	71.3	28.7	77	68.8	31.2
20. Assessment of cognitive style (field dependent/independent)	96	51.0	40.6	8.3	77	48.1	42.9	9.1	90	65.6	34.4	75	62.7	37.3
21. Evaluation of staff in-service and training programs	99	53.5	36.4	10.1	80	51.2	38.7	10.0	95	73.7	26.3	78	70.5	29.5
22. Evaluation of curriculum and materials	99	52.5	38.4	9.1	80	48.8	40.0	11.3	94	66.0	34.0	76	61.8	38.2
23. Evaluation of community involvement and attitude	99	58.6	31.3	10.1	80	56.3	32.5	11.3	92	66.3	33.7	76	67.1	32.9
24. Evaluation of project management	98	67.3	24.5	8.2	79	65.8	25.3	8.9	95	83.2	16.8	77	83.1	16.9
25. Determining cost-effectiveness	99	48.5	40.4	11.1	80	46.2	41.2	12.5	94	71.3	28.7	76	67.1	32.9
26. Participation of the staff-teaching and administrative-in the evaluation of the project	98	55.1	32.7	12.1	79	51.9	34.2	13.9	93	67.7	32.3	76	69.7	30.3

Table 3

Evaluation Features	Full Sample # checking as required feature	Full Sample Nothing used to date	Full Sample Ineffective	Full Sample Marginally effective	Full Sample Moderately effective	Full Sample Extremely effective	Full Sample No rating	LEA Sample # checking as required feature	LEA Sample Nothing used to date	LEA Sample Ineffective	LEA Sample Marginally effective	LEA Sample Moderately effective	LEA Sample Extremely effective	LEA Sample No rating
Criteria for the selection of instruments to be used in the evaluation	66	9.1	0.0	28.8	51.5	9.1	1.5	56	8.9	0.0	25.0	55.4	10.7	0.0
Measurement of oral language proficiency and/or dominance in English	83	3.6	3.6	28.9	45.8	14.5	3.6	72	4.2	2.8	29.2	45.8	15.3	2.8
Measurement of oral language proficiency and/or dominance in language other than English	79	12.7	3.8	29.1	36.7	13.9	3.8	70	11.4	4.3	25.7	40.0	15.7	2.9
Measurement of achievement in reading or language arts in English	81	1.2	3.7	27.2	42.0	23.5	2.5	71	1.4	2.8	25.4	42.3	25.4	2.8
Measurement of achievement in reading or language arts in language other than English	73	12.3	5.5	47.9	23.3	9.6	1.4	65	10.8	6.2	47.7	24.6	9.2	1.5
Measurement of achievement gains in mathematics in language other than English	64	17.2	4.7	25.0	35.9	15.6	1.6	57	15.8	3.5	22.8	38.6	17.5	1.8
Measurement of achievement gains in mathematics in English	66	4.5	1.5	21.2	42.4	28.8	1.5	60	5.0	0.0	20.0	43.3	30.0	1.7
Measurement of achievement gains in school subjects other than reading, language arts, or math (most frequently cited were science and social studies	43	18.6	0.0	39.5	30.2	9.3	2.3	36	16.7	0.0	44.4	27.8	8.3	2.8
Measurement of students' attitudes over time (self concept, attitudes toward school, language culture)	64	25.0	9.4	34.4	18.8	10.9	1.6	57	26.3	8.8	31.6	21.1	10.5	1.8
Descriptive statistics about the extent of program participation (e.g., numbers of teachers and other instructional staff)	71	5.6	0.0	14.1	39.4	35.2	5.6	60	5.0	0.0	13.3	41.7	36.7	3.3
Descriptive statistics on students' background (e.g., SES, parental employment, family size, ethnic group membership	53	5.7	7.5	20.8	43.4	18.9	3.8	47	6.4	6.4	23.4	40.4	19.1	4.3

Evaluation Features	Full Sample # checking as required feature	Full Sample Nothing used to date	Full Sample Ineffective	Full Sample Marginally effective	Full Sample Moderately effective	Full Sample Extremely effective	Full Sample No rating	LEA Sample # checking as required feature	LEA Sample Nothing used to date	LEA Sample Ineffective	LEA Sample Marginally effective	LEA Sample Moderately effective	LEA Sample Extremely effective	LEA Sample No rating
Descriptive information about the content and substance of the project	81	4.9	0.0	17.3	46.9	25.9	4.9	68	2.9	0.0	19.1	45.6	29.4	2.9
Descriptive information on program implementation (e.g., classroom methodology, use of language in the classroom, role of the teacher aide, team teaching, etc.)	75	5.3	0.0	20.0	46.7	22.7	5.3	63	4.8	0.0	20.6	46.0	25.4	3.2
Measurement of teacher effectiveness	57	14.0	3.5	36.8	29.8	8.8	7.0	46	15.2	4.3	32.6	34.8	10.9	2.2
Assessment of staff in-service and training components	79	3.8	2.5	26.6	35.4	27.8	3.8	67	4.5	3.0	23.9	35.8	31.3	1.5
Criterion-referenced assessment of project objectives	62	6.5	3.2	30.6	41.9	12.9	4.8	53	7.5	3.8	28.3	43.4	13.2	3.8
Field testing and assessment of instructional materials	40	22.5	5.0	30.0	37.5	2.5	2.5	35	22.9	2.9	31.4	37.1	2.9	2.9
Statistical validation of test instruments used in the project	44	18.2	4.5	27.3	36.4	11.4	2.3	38	21.1	2.6	28.9	34.2	13.2	0.0
Measurement of community involvement in the project	73	12.3	6.8	24.7	37.0	15.1	4.1	63	11.1	4.8	25.4	38.1	17.5	3.2
Measurement of community satisfaction with the project	62	17.7	4.8	21.0	35.5	16.1	4.8	52	17.3	1.9	19.2	38.5	19.2	3.8
Cost effectiveness measures of project components	39	25.6	5.1	28.2	25.6	7.7	7.7	34	26.5	2.9	26.5	29.4	8.8	5.9
Use of national achievement norms	54	9.3	3.7	35.2	27.8	18.5	5.6	49	8.2	4.1	34.7	28.6	20.4	4.1
Use of non-treatment control/ comparison group	55	18.2	9.1	36.4	25.5	5.5	5.5	48	16.7	8.3	37.5	27.1	6.3	4.2
Establishment of baseline data	51	11.8	3.9	17.6	37.3	23.5	5.9	45	11.1	2.2	13.3	42.2	26.7	4.4
Use of statistical analysis in reporting student performance (mean, standard deviations, tests of statistical significance)	65	7.7	1.5	21.5	38.5	23.1	7.7	58	6.9	1.7	22.4	37.9	25.9	5.2

Table 4

	Full Sample n	Full Sample %	LEA Sample n	LEA Sample %	Cases in Full Sample n	Cases in Full Sample %	Cases in LEA Sample n	Cases in LEA Sample %
Evaluation Tasks Causing Difficulties	87*		73*		236		196	
Planning evaluation		64.4		61.6		23.7		23.0
Conducting evaluation		43.7		39.7		16.1		14.8
Analyzing results		35.6		38.4		13.1		14.3
Interpreting results		32.2		31.5		11.9		11.7
Reporting results		25.3		27.4		9.3		10.2
Justifying results		40.2		41.1		14.8		15.3
Utilizing results		29.9		28.8		11.0		10.7
Any Prior Evaluations	95		78					
Yes		72.6		79.5				
No		25.3		17.9				
Don't know		2.1		2.6				
Type of Evaluator	69		62					
External		55.1		54.8				
Internal		22.5		22.6				
Both		21.7		22.6				
Results Reported to Whom	67*		60*		364		337	
External funding source		79.1		78.3		14.6		13.9
District administration		88.1		91.7		16.2		16.3
School board		56.7		60.0		10.4		10.7
Project administration		91.0		91.7		16.8		16.3
School principals		73.9		79.0		14.0		14.5
Teaching staff		73.9		75.8		14.0		13.9
Parents and community		59.4		62.9		11.3		11.6
Students		11.6		11.3		2.2		2.1
Others (Parent Advisory Council, State Department of Education)		2.9		3.2		.5		.6
Results Used in Changing Project	66		61					
Yes		74.2		75.4				
No		18.2		18.0				
Don't know		7.6		6.6				
Results Useful to Whom	46*		42*		174		162	
Teachers		62.5		63.6		17.2		17.3
Principals		45.8		45.5		12.6		12.3
Research personnel		41.7		45.5		11.5		12.3
Project administration		97.8		97.6		25.9		25.3
District administration		45.8		45.5		12.6		12.3
School board		27.1		27.3		7.5		7.4
Parents		41.7		43.2		11.5		11.7
Others (students)		4.2		4.5		1.1		1.2

* Multiple responses possible; percentages do not sum to 100.

	Full Sample n	Full Sample %	LEA Sample n	LEA Sample %	Cases in Full Sample n	Cases in Full Sample %	Cases in LEA Sample n	Cases in LEA Sample %
If Results Not Used, Reasons Why	11*		10*		38		32	
Content of the evaluation		45.5		50.0		13.2		15.6
Qualifications of the evaluator		36.4		40.0		10.5		12.5
Manner of presenting results		45.5		40.0		13.2		12.5
Quality of data analysis		54.5		50.0		15.8		15.6
Failure to use results		54.5		50.0		15.8		15.6
Delays in reporting results		27.3		20.0		7.9		6.3
Lack of relationship between evaluation and instruction		27.3		20.0		7.9		6.3
Lack of staff participation in evaluation		36.4		30.0		10.5		9.4
Other (no comparison between experimental and control groups; negative relationships between administration and staff)		18.2		20.0		5.3		6.3
Recommendations for Improving Evaluations	86*		71*		242		203	
Better reporting systems		41.9		42.3		14.9		14.8
Technical assistance		66.3		66.2		23.6		23.2
Fewer requirements		11.6		14.1		4.1		4.9
More specific requirements		47.7		43.7		16.9		15.3
Broader options in designs		23.3		23.9		8.3		8.4
Better instruments		81.4		85.9		28.9		30.0
Other (e.g., better tests, designs, reports, process evaluations)		9.3		9.9		3.3		3.4
Types of Technical Assistance Desired	89*		74*		322		275	
Workshops for administrators		86.5		86.5		23.9		23.3
Workshops for evaluators		57.3		60.8		15.8		16.4
Workshops for parents		42.7		45.9		11.8		12.4
Workshops for teaching staff		61.8		63.5		17.1		17.1
Consultants to develop evaluation system		53.9		54.1		14.9		14.5
Guidance materials		52.8		52.7		14.6		14.2
Other (e.g., workshops on instruments, for paraprofessionals)		6.7		8.1		1.9		2.2

* Multiple responses possible; percentages do not sum to 100.